



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*hr*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/754,518	01/12/2004	Yoshiharu Hidaka	60188-751	8259

7590 06/02/2005

Jack Q. Lever, Jr.  
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY  
600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

LE, THAO X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/754,518

Applicant(s)

HIDAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Thao X. Le

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/12/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-4 and 9-12 in the reply filed on 12 May 2005 is acknowledged. In addition, the Office Action dated 04/13/05 inadvertently identified claims 9-12 as a semiconductor device. However, claims 9-12 are drawn to method of making a semiconductor device.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2814

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior ART (APA).

Regarding claim 1, APA discloses a semiconductor substrate, specification page 23 line 3, having a notch, fig. 8, the notch having two shoulder portions R1 and R2, specification page 23 line 5, each configured as an arc and a difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions R1 and R2 being 0.186 mm (R1-R2), fig. 8.

But, APA does not disclose the difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions R1 and R2 being not less than 0 mm and not more than 0.1 mm.

However, APA discloses the difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions R1 and R2 being 0.186 mm (R1-R2), fig. 8. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to use the curvature of APA in the range as claimed, because it has been held that where the general conditions of the claims are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable range by routine experimentation. See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claim 2, APA discloses the semiconductor substrate wherein each of the two shoulders portion R1 and R2 has a curvature not less than 0.3 mm, fig. 8.

Regarding claims 3-4, APA discloses the semiconductor substrate wherein the notch has a bottom portion configured as arc and the bottom has a curvature  $V_r$  not less than 1 mm, Fig. 8, wherein the notch has two wall surface each mirror-finished, specification page 23 line 9, and forming an angle  $\theta_v$  not less than  $89^\circ$  and not more than  $95^\circ$  therebetween, fig. 8.

Regarding claim 9, APA discloses method for fabricating a semiconductor substrate having a notch in an edge portion thereof the method comprising the step of: a processing step of mirror-polishing the edge portion, page 23 line, the processing step including the step of shaping each of two shoulder portions R1 and R2 of the notch into an arc and adjusting a difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions to a value of 0.186 mm (R1-R2), fig. 8.

But, APA does not discloses the difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions R1 and R2 being not less than 0 mm and not more than 0.1 mm.

However, APA discloses the difference in curvature between the two shoulder portions R1 and R2 being 0.186 mm (R1-R2), fig. 8. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to use the curvature of APA in the range as claimed, because it has been held that where the general conditions of the claims are discloses in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable range by routine experimentation. See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimension or upon another variable

Art Unit: 2814

recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. In re Woodruff, 919 F2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding claim 10, APA discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the processing step includes the step of adjusting the curvature of each of the two shoulder portions to 0.3 mm or more, fig. 8.

Regarding claim 11, APA discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the processing step includes the step of shaping a bottom portion of the notch into an arc and adjusting a curvature  $V_r$  of the bottom portion to 1 mm or more, fig. 8.

Regarding claim 12, APA discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the processing step includes the step of mirror-finishing two wall surfaces of the notch to form an angle  $\theta_v$  not less than  $89^\circ$  and not more than  $95^\circ$  therebetween, fig. 8.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao X. Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-1708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M. Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272 -1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2814

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several horizontal strokes and a vertical line intersecting them, forming a stylized 'L' or 'T' shape.

Thao X. Le  
Patent Examiner  
20 May 2005